

REMARKS

The Examiner stated that “Applicants are required to furnish the formal drawings in response to this office action.” In response, Applicants are submitting the formal drawings herewith.

The Examiner indicated claims 5-16, 22-27, 32-43 and 49-54 are allowed. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner’s indication of allowed subject matter.

The Examiner objected to claims 1-55.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 17-21, 28-31 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yin *et al.* (hereinafter “Yin”) US patent application Publication No. 2002/0091539.

Applicants respectfully traverse the claim objections and §102 rejections with the following arguments.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-55, allegedly “because they include reference characters, which are not enclosed within parentheses, for example DES, SAP and PCMS.”

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that the pending claims do not include reference characters in the drawings. Applicants maintain that DES, SAP and PCMS are not reference characters in the drawings. In FIG. 1, for example, the reference characters are 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24. In FIG. 1, DES and PCMS are part of the text in the blocks of the block diagram and are not reference characters.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully contend that the objection to claims 1-55 be withdrawn.

35 U.S.C. §102

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 17-21, 28-31 and 55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yin *et al.* (hereinafter “Yin”) US patent application Publication No. 2002/0091539.

Claims 1, 2, and 4

Applicants respectfully contend that Yin does not anticipate claim 1, because Yin does not teach each and every feature of claim 1. For example, Yin does not teach the feature: “said relational database including contract datasets, vendor datasets, and purchase item datasets”.

The Examiner argues the Yin discloses ““passing the contract dataset through a software filter ([0083]-[0085]) that determines whether to store the contract dataset or a first portion thereof in a relational database of the DES, said relational database including contract datasets, vendor datasets, and purchase item datasets” ([0097]-[0103]).”

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that Yin[0097]-[0103] is totally silent as to “said relational database including contract datasets, vendor datasets, and purchase item datasets”. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner quote the specific text in Yin that allegedly teaches that the relational database includes each of the preceding types of datasets (i.e., contract datasets, vendor datasets, and purchase item datasets). To further prosecution of this docket, it is important for the Examiner to disclose the Examiner’s analysis so that Applicants can understand the Examiner’s argument and respond to the Examiner’s argument appropriately, by argument and/or claim amendment(s).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Yin does not

anticipate claim 1, and that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 2 and 4 depend from claim 1, Applicants contend that claims 2 and 4 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claim 3

Applicants respectfully contend that Yin does not anticipate claim 3, because Yin does not teach each and every feature of claim 3. For example, Yin does not teach the feature: “receiving a contract dataset by a first SAP contract management system from a second SAP contract management system; and passing the contract dataset through a software filter that determines whether to store the contract dataset or a first portion thereof in a SAP database of the first SAP contract management system.”

The Examiner argues: “As to claim 3, Yin discloses the claimed "receiving a contract dataset by a first SAP contract management system from a second SAP contract management system" ([0011]; [0023]-[0025]; [0076]-[0085]); and "passing the contract dataset through a software filter that determines whether to store the contract dataset or a second portion thereof in a non-SAP database of the first SAP contract management system" ([0097]-[0103]).”

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that none of the preceding paragraphs in Yin cited by the Examiner disclose anything about a first SAP contract management system, a second SAP contract management system and/or a SAP database. In fact, a text search of Yin reveals that “SAP” does not appear anywhere within the Yin patent.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Yin does not anticipate claim 3, and that claim 3 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 17-21

Applicants respectfully contend that Yin does not anticipate claim 17, because Yin does not teach each and every feature of claim 17. For example, Yin does not teach the features: “said execution document having an existing attribute value for a purchase item in the contract dataset; receiving notice at the DES from the PCMS of a new attribute value that is to replace the existing attribute value; and replacing the existing attribute value with the new attribute value in the execution document”.

The Examiner argues: “As to claim 17, Yin discloses the claimed "having an execution document at a decentralized execution system of a procurement contract management system, said execution document being derived from a contract dataset in the DES, said execution document having an existing attribute value for a purchase item in the contract dataset ([0011]; [0023]-[0025]; [0076]-[0085], [0101]); "receiving notice at the DES from PCMS of a new attribute value that is to replace the existing item in the contract dataset" ([0020]-[0021][0025]); and "replacing the existing attribute value with the new attribute in the execution document" ([0025], [0074]), [0098]-[0099]; [0136]).”

In response, Applicants respectfully contend that none of the preceding paragraphs in Yin cited by the Examiner disclose the preceding features of claim 17. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner identify specifically in Yin: the existing attribute value, the new attribute value. Applicants also request that the Examiner provide a quotation from Yin indicating the step of “replacing the existing attribute value with the new attribute value in the execution document.” To further prosecution of this docket, it is important for the Examiner to disclose the Examiner’s analysis so that Applicants can understand the Examiner’s argument and

respond to the Examiner's argument appropriately, by argument and/or claim amendment(s).

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Yin does not anticipate claim 17, and that claim 17 is in condition for allowance. Since claims 18-21 depend from claim 17, Applicants contend that claims 18-21 are likewise in condition for allowance.

Claims 28-29

The Examiner argues: "As to claims 28-29, the limitations of claims 28-29 have been noted in the rejection of claims 1-2 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale."

In response, Applicants make reference to Applicants' arguments *supra* for claims 1-2 as being applicable to claims 28-29.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Yin does not anticipate claims 28-29, and that claims 28-29 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 30-31

The Examiner argues: "As to claims 30-31, the limitations of claims 30-31 have been noted in the rejection of claims 3-4 above. They are, therefore, rejected under the same rationale."

In response, Applicants make reference to Applicants' arguments *supra* for claims 3-4 as being applicable to claims 30-31.

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully maintain that Yin does not anticipate claims 30-31, and that claims 30-31 are in condition for allowance.


Claim 55

Since claim 55 has been canceled, the rejection of claim 55 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is moot.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicants respectfully believe that all pending claims and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicants invites the Examiner to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below. The Director is hereby authorized to charge and/or credit Deposit Account 09-0457.

Date: 10/10/2005


Jack P. Friedman
Registration No. 44,688

Schmeiser, Olsen & Watts
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, New York 12110
(518) 220-1850